1 2 3	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERIC	
5	vs.) CASE NO. 3:10-00250
6	MATTHEW PAUL DEHART)
7		
8		
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	
10		
11	BEFORE:	THE HONORABLE ALETA A. TRAUGER
12	DATE:	APRIL 12, 2012
13	TIME:	1:30 P.M.
14		
15	APPEARANCES:	
16 17	FOR THE GOVERNMENT:	CARRIE DAUGHTREY U.S. Attorney's Office Nashville, Tennessee
18	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	MARK SCRUGGS
19		Nashville, Tennessee
20		
21	REPORTED BY:	BEVERLY E. "BECKY" COLE, RPR
22		OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER A-837 U.S. COURTHOUSE
23		NASHVILLE, TN 37203 (615) 830-3386
24		
25		

THE COURT: Good afternoon. We're here on United 1 2 States versus Matthew Paul Dehart. We have Carrie Daughtrey 3 for the government and Mark Scruggs for the defendant. 4 defendant is in the courtroom. 5 We're here on the defendant's motion to compel. 6 government filed a lengthy response which I presume you 7 received? MR. SCRUGGS: Yes, Your Honor. I received it 9 last night at 8:00 p.m. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Well, you got it before I did. I was able to digest it. I hope you were able to digest it. 11 12 MR. SCRUGGS: It was difficult, but we survived. 1.3 THE COURT: All right. What are the lingering 14 issues? 15 It sounds to me like most of this you should have been 16 able to work out if you were being reasonable with each 17 other, so let me hear what your continuing complaints are. 18 MR. SCRUGGS: Your Honor, just first as a 19 preliminary matter, I would move to strike the government's 20 response as being untimely. 21 Part of the problem here has been the government's 2.2 failure to respond to requests with regard to discovery, and 23 I would submit that waiting to 12 hours before we have the 24 hearing basically denies my client due process. 25 I'm not asking for a continuance. I just would submit

that's not the professional way of handling things.

1.3

2.1

2.2

THE COURT: I'll let Ms. Daughtrey make a statement as to why she didn't respond in a timely manner to the original motion to compel which was filed on March 14. That's not contained in her response.

She did timely respond to your motion for hearing which basically is a response to the motion to compel. I'm not going to strike her response, but I will let her put her excuse on the record.

So moving on to the merits, tell me what it is you do not have that you still need.

MR. SCRUGGS: Judge, the first thing that we're asking for are all items or copies of all items that were seized from my client's home in Indiana in January of 2010 as well as all items that were taken from his person when he was arrested on August 6, 2010, and all items taken from his apartment in Canada.

We would like to have access to those items and copies of any electronic media with regard to all those items pursuant to Rule 16(a)(1)(E) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

THE COURT: Well, first of all, let me ask you this. Why have you not arranged to get the hard drive that Ms. Hodde had requested and apparently has been ready for quite some time?

MR. SCRUGGS: Judge, one of the hard drives, from 1 2 what I understand, is ready to be -- from what I understand, 3 to be examined there at the government offices. All right? 4 When I got into this case in late January, at that 5 point in time prior counsel had hired an expert from -- I'm 6 not exactly sure where he lives, but I believe he's mainly 7 based out of New York, and my ability to communicate with 8 him left a lot to be desired. 9 I immediately hired Mr. Jim Kempvanee, who's here. has testified in courts here in the Middle District before 10 11 as well as other courts. 12 I'm prepared to qualify him as an expert. I have his 13 CV with me, and he'll testify here today on why he needs 14 what he needs. 15 But the bottom line, Judge, is that going to the 16 government's office simply to view and make his analysis is 17 not sufficient for Mr. Kempvanee to do the type of job he 18 needs to do. 19 What we have proposed is that we would cooperate with 20 the government in deleting or writing over any child 21 pornography images. 2.2 Mr. Kempvanee has done this in other cases. I have a 23 copy of an order -- if I may, Judge, if I could approach? 24 THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SCRUGGS: I have provided a copy to counsel.

25

Magistrate Bryant has allowed this in other case very similar. Mr. Kempvanee is prepared to testify on why it is necessary for him to obtain a redacted copy of -- actually, there's only one hard drive, Judge, that is alleged to have child pornography on it.

1.3

2.2

There are numerous other electronic media for which there's no claim there's child pornography on it, so there shouldn't be a problem with us getting a copy of all those items, but Mr. Kempvanee, when I hired him, indicated to me that he needs to have a copy of all the electronic media as well as a redacted copy of the one hard drive allegedly having child pornography on it, and take it to his office so that he can use his software and his equipment in order to properly analyze this and do his job for us.

THE COURT: How does it help him analyze child pornography if the child pornography has been removed from the computer?

MR. SCRUGGS: Judge, he is not being hired to determine whether something is child pornography or not.

Judge, this case is not about child pornography. This is about how certain images got onto my client's hard drive.

And it's our position that the alleged victim in this case placed these images on his hard drive as a result of their relationship in another matter, of which they were — they shared.

And, basically, if the court would allow me, I'll give you sort of a synopsis of what this is, in fact, about.

Judge, my client was arrested at the border on

August 16, 2010. The purpose of the arrest had nothing to do with child pornography.

The purpose of the arrest had to do with his alleged involvement in WikiLeaks. Ms. Daughtrey has --

THE COURT: That's the national security -
MR. SCRUGGS: That's the national security. She
alluded to that, but the bottom line, that's what it is
about.

THE COURT: Okay.

1.3

2.2

MR. SCRUGGS: During that entire weekend, Judge, he was interrogated by FBI agents with regard to his alleged connection with WikiLeaks as well as Mr. Tamberello's (phonetic) alleged connection with WikiLeaks, and so forth.

The child pornography is just a red herring in this case but the reason why this man has been held for approximately 20 months at this time.

During the time period between August 6 and August 18, he was interrogated numerous times by FBI agents. He was drugged. And he has little, if any, recollection with regard to what he stated during that time period.

THE COURT: But this was all in connection with the other investigation?

1 MR. SCRUGGS: Right. 2 THE COURT: And Ms. Daughtrey asserts she doesn't 3 have those statements anyway. 4 MR. SCRUGGS: It is imperative that we be able to 5 get to those statements because we believe that during that 6 interrogation, part of what he did was give them access to 7 certain passwords that allowed them to get into different 8 media that he has that will have exculpatory material on it. 9 And that type of material --10 THE COURT: Doesn't he have the words that you 11 need in order to find out --12 MR. SCRUGGS: Judge, the items -- you may have 1.3 noticed, Judge, that the -- that Ms. Daughtrey filed as an 14 attachment to her response some consent forms --15 THE COURT: Right. 16 MR. SCRUGGS: -- that were signed -- allegedly 17 signed by my client August 18, 2010, in New Hampshire. All 18 right? 19 You'll see that on those consent forms, he's given 20 certain passwords. 2.1 And when we talk about passwords, we're talking about 2.2 passwords that could be anywhere from 25 to 100 characters 23 in length, very complicated passwords. The passwords that we have are passwords to either 24 25 e-mail or computers that would have exculpatory material on

```
1
     that.
 2
                THE COURT: You are saying the passwords on these
 3
     consent forms?
 4
                MR. SCRUGGS: There are additional passwords as
 5
     well, Judge.
 6
                THE COURT: Well, does your client not know his
 7
     own passwords, Mr. Scruggs?
                MR. SCRUGGS: Not all of them, Judge, because
 8
 9
     they have so many characters. And some of the items and
10
     which have been seized would contain those passwords for our
11
     computer analyst to access certain devices in order to find
12
     exculpatory material.
13
                THE COURT: Where were they seized? Were they in
14
    his wallet, what?
15
                MR. SCRUGGS: Judge, I have a list, if I could?
16
                THE COURT: Yes. Let me ask you quickly, who is
17
     the prosecutor in this Jeremy Tummons (phonetic) case?
18
                MS. DAUGHREY: Your Honor, that was Matt Everitt
19
     that handled that, and I do know some bits and pieces, and
20
     it is extremely different from this particular case, and I
21
     will address that with the court.
2.2
                THE COURT: Very good. Let's see. Return on
23
     search warrant. This was the search done where?
24
                MR. SCRUGGS: January 2010, at the defendant's
25
     residence in Indiana.
```

1 THE COURT: Okay.

1.3

2.2

MR. SCRUGGS: We need to have a copy of all of the media as well as the return of any other items on that list.

THE COURT: Property seized from P-E-I apartment, unknown dates.

MR. SCRUGGS: And from what I understand, the only item on there that contains -- allegedly contains child pornography is the hard drive related to a Gateway laptop.

That's what I understand.

So there shouldn't be any problems with giving us copies of all those items except for that. We'll get to the redaction issue in just a second.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SCRUGGS: Now, with regard to the other handwritten list that you have, you'll see in front of you, you have a list of items that were taken from my client when he was arrested in Maine as well as items that he had stored at his apartment in Canada.

Judge, we have asked for any documentation related to his arrest and seizure of all those items either at the time of his arrest or in his apartment in Canada, have not been provided with anything. And this is all supposedly related to national security, is what it is.

Well, the bottom line is -- Judge, is that we need to

have access to those items in order to show -- and I guess I have to basically just tell you our defense here, Judge, in order to make sure that you understand this is relevant, all right, didn't really want to have to do that, but the bottom line, Judge, is that this case also involves some very sophisticated persons who are involved in computers.

1.3

2.2

And it involves hacking. And it involves being able to show that, for example, the government alleges that my client impersonated some woman in trying to get

Mr. Tamberello to send pornographic pictures of himself to my client.

Judge, we firmly believe that we'll be able to show that this woman does, in fact, exist, all right, and that there will be evidence of that if we're allowed to have access to these things.

THE COURT: Well, the existence of the woman does not belie the defendant pretending to be an existing woman.

MR. SCRUGGS: I understand, Judge, but if we show that she existed and that she had an e-mail, then I think the jury would be able to make a pretty good inference that she's the one who actually communicated with Mr. Tamberello and was able to get him to send these things to the image board that my client was a monitor of basically.

So you have to understand that my client was basically a monitor for a group called "4-chan". He operated or

monitored, I should say, an image board upon which persons could upload images, pictures, whatever.

Mr. Tamberello was one of them who did that.

THE COURT: What's the name of the group?

MR. SCRUGGS: 4-chan, number 4, hyphen, C-H-A-N.

That's what he did.

1.3

2.2

Tamberello was one of the persons that participated in that. He also was one of the persons that participated in this computer game that they all participated in, this "World of Warcraft". All right?

So Tamberello was the one who did -- on his own communicated with this woman and also on his own uploaded these things to this image board site that would be found on my client's computer.

My client, you could think of him sort of as a policeman who when persons uploaded improper items onto the image board would delete it, all right?

So that's why we need our -- I'm basically telling them our whole case here -- but that's why we need to have our expert go in and break this apart to show that that is, in fact, what it was.

The other part of this too is that the government on Mr. Tamberello's phone apparently had an image of a female, pornographic image of a female, that was apparently deleted, who very well could have been the person that he had been

communicating with, with regard to the pornographic images to begin with.

I mean, the total lack or the total reluctance of the government to provide evidence in this case that we're entitled to under Rule 16 is overwhelming, and, frankly, I would ask the case be dismissed just for that.

But the point is, Judge --

THE COURT: Well, if there is evidence that you need — that I determine that you need for your defense that the government is unwilling to give you because of national security, the case will be dismissed.

Go ahead.

2.

2.2

MR. SCRUGGS: Again, that's how all the items on the list -- again, that's from my client's best recollection of what was taken from him both when he was arrested up in Maine as well as his apartment in Canada; those items have information that ties into our defense related to what they found on his Gateway laptop in Indiana.

And all that ties into Mr. Tamberello and the relationship that he had with 4-chan and the image board basically.

So that is pretty much our defense in a nutshell.

Again, I have got my -- my client will testify regarding what happened to him the first week or ten days.

And you know something that's really interesting here

is this, and that is that he was held -- let's see -- he was arrested on August 6. He had his first hearing, the detention hearing, in Maine on August 11.

When he was arrested on August 6, he asked for an attorney. He was continuously interrogated by an FBI agent. I have a copy of his card that I'm going to submit.

THE COURT: His card?

MR. SCRUGGS: His card. Yes, the FBI agent's card who interrogated him.

THE COURT: Oh.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. SCRUGGS: Okay?

We know -- I mean, at that point in time, my client -- his father had hired a lawyer for him out of Indiana to represent him on this because of what had happened back in January.

We know that he had the detention hearing in Maine on August 11, and he was appointed a public defender at that point in time.

So if you will look at that attachment that they attached that has all the consent forms on it, that's August 18th in New Hampshire, there's no mention of waiver of any lawyer or the fact that he had a lawyer. My client doesn't even remember any of this.

But clearly what it is, it's an effort by the government to circumvent my client's rights. And that leads

me up to the other thing that I need to -- as far as part of my defense. And that is that I have got to file a motion to suppress everything that they've discovered from the Gateway laptop in Indiana because it is our position they did not get into that Gateway laptop until after his arrest and interrogations.

You know, Agent Kniss is here. Agent Kniss did the

You know, Agent Kniss is here. Agent Kniss did the analysis, but Agent Kniss was already supplied with a rebuilt image of that hard drive; that is, the Gateway laptop.

THE COURT: What do you mean a rebuilt image, a mirror image?

MR. SCRUGGS: Yes.

1.3

2.1

2.2

THE COURT: That's not rebuilt image, as I understand it.

MR. SCRUGGS: This is the way it's been explained to me.

You can image a hard drive, all right? But you can't get into it unless you have passwords, and that's what my expert will testify to, from what I understand.

This FBI Agent Hill is the person -- I think this guy was with the task force working with FBI, he's out of Indiana, he's the person who actually rebuilt it and got into it.

And we haven't been provided with no documentation

regarding the chain of custody of this hard drive or anything about what Agent Hill did.

1.3

It is critical to know that date upon which he actually got into the hard drive.

THE COURT: Who is Agent Hill? I thought that the forensic report here was prepared by Mr. Kniss?

MR. SCRUGGS: Agent Kniss did the analysis. When Kniss received the hard drive, somebody had already gotten into it. That is, Agent Hill, the agent in the task force in Indiana is the person who actually did the mirror image as well as rebuilding it so that you can get into it.

Again, my expert can explain that process on how it's done.

Never have we been provided with any information with regard to what Agent Hill did and how he went about doing it or the chain of custody or anything like that.

So that gets back to the motion to suppress. That gets back to all these things that I got to get done before May 29.

THE COURT: Good luck.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$ SCRUGGS: I mean, this is the boat that I'm in here, the pickle that I'm in.

You know, I'm trying to move this case along. I got into this the end of January. You can imagine how difficult this is in terms of understanding it, to begin with, but as

far as getting these things are concerned, it is critical that my expert assist me in presenting this.

1.3

2.2

And number one is breaking down, analyzing, and assist me in presenting it to the jury and assist me in helping with the motion to suppress as well.

THE COURT: When did you inform the government that you had a different expert from the one that Ms. Hodde had been working with for quite some time?

MR. SCRUGGS: Probably today.

THE COURT: Well, that's not very helpful. She apparently has been waiting to get the name of an agent in New York that they could furnish this material to so that the expert up in New York could supervise the review of it up there.

So I think for you to place all of the blame for delay on Ms. Daughtrey is a little bit misplaced.

MR. SCRUGGS: Judge, if you would, Ms. Hodde sent her a letter July 25, 2011, that's attached to one of motions, document number 70. The response didn't happen until November 22, 2011.

From what I've been told -- I wasn't here, but from what I've been told, y'all had a hearing sometime in October.

At that point in time, from what I'm understanding, Ms. Daughtrey represented to the court that Indiana was

going to take this case over.

I don't know. I mean, she can respond to that, but apparently Indiana hasn't taken anything over.

We're here about all these other things related to national security, and you know what? My client sits in jail.

As far as -- let me just say this. With regard to Mr. Kempvanee is concerned, I don't know what difference it makes whether I would have told her or not because the point was we were going to have to file a motion to get her to let us have copies of everything, including a redacted copy.

It wouldn't have made any difference if I told her a month ago or not. Mr. Lane was hard to get ahold of. He lives in New York and travels the world, so Mr. Lane just wasn't going to work.

He wasn't going to be in a position to help this young man out whose been held for -- like I said, for 20 months now waiting, you know, for his day in court.

We're prepared at this point in time to present witnesses to back up everything I have just said.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Scruggs. Let me hear from Ms. Daughtrey.

I guess my first question, Ms. Daughtrey, is that you told me in October that if the charges were subsumed in Indiana this case would be dismissed, and you told me in

November that there was probably going to be an Indiana indictment by the end of November.

1.3

2.2

And then you told me in December that there would be charges in Indiana and Maryland.

And it was my understanding that then this case would be subsumed and that would be the end of it in this district. So what's going to on?

MS. DAUGHREY: Your Honor, I apologize for that.

I got the information from an AUSA up in Indiana that they were interested in the case and they were reviewing it.

And at some point, Indiana decided that the only thing that they were willing to take was the possession and receipt and distribution of child pornography out of Indiana, that they wanted not to be doing the other cases involving the victims.

I'm not entirely sure I know why that is, but I can tell you there are only two AUSA's in that particular office, and I think it was more of a staffing problem than anything else.

I was very frustrated by it, but by December, I was beginning to realize this, and that's why I was mentioning that there was going to be an investigation going on in Maryland, which I understand is still ongoing at this time.

So there are likely to be cases -- and Ms. Hodde was aware of that -- cases that are coming out of two or

possibly three jurisdictions.

1.3

2.2

THE COURT: Well, what's happening in Maryland?

MS. DAUGHREY: My understanding is that it's

under investigation at this time.

THE COURT: The pornography case?

MS. DAUGHREY: There is another victim in Maryland who is a teenage victim, minor teenage, who had the same kind of exchange with Mr. Dehart as what we see with the victim here in Tennessee.

And as is typical with adolescent victims, he is not necessarily anxious about coming in front of the court and dealing with that. And so I don't know what their status is with working with him and going forward with charges at that time.

It is the government's intent at this point to be proceeding, you know, to trial with this particular case, and Ms. Hodde was aware of that.

Unfortunately, I did not know that Mark Scruggs was going to ask to be on this case until February 7 when I received and e-mail from him, which is included in the filing that I made. I believe that would be Attachment Number 3.

You can see the communication we had then. I have received one phone call from Mr. Scruggs subsequent to that basically demanding copies of everything but not being

willing to talk about anything.

2.

2.2

He has not called me since then or had any communication with me.

I do apologize to the court for not getting a response in right away. I will admit that when Ms. Beasley got in touch with me that it had slipped my mind that I needed to do that because I do have a very heavy caseload.

I also have some other personal matters that are going on, and I apologize, I have also had a sick child all week and have just come into the office to do this hearing, so -- could I have a moment, Your Honor?

(Counsel is emotional.)

THE COURT: We'll take a short recess.

(Break.)

THE COURT: Okay. As usual, we made a lot of progress in chambers sometimes we can't make in the courtroom.

At any rate, the parties have requested some time to talk amongst themselves. Ms. Daughtrey is going to make Agent Kniss available to Mr. Scruggs, and Mr. Scruggs and the expert witness are going to go up to Ms. Daughtrey's office with Detective Kniss and share some more information about exactly what is needed here. And then we're going to reconvene after that takes place.

And we were talking about reconvening -- would you get

```
1
     those two other calendars I have next week -- I actually
 2
    probably have a whole lot more time on Tuesday than Monday.
 3
                MR. SCRUGGS: Tuesday is good too.
 4
                THE COURT: Okay. Let me get the calendar for
 5
     next week and maybe reconvene on Tuesday would be better.
 6
     That will give you another day to get ahold of all the
 7
     people you have to get ahold of as well, Ms. Daughtrey.
 8
                MR. SCRUGGS: May I check with my expert?
 9
                THE COURT: Yes.
10
                (Pause.)
11
                MR. SCRUGGS: Tuesday is okay.
12
                MS. DAUGHREY: I'm available all day Tuesday as
1.3
     well.
14
                MR. SCRUGGS: I would be available by 11:00.
15
                THE COURT: After 11:00?
16
                MR. SCRUGGS: From 11:00 on.
17
                THE COURT: Okay. 1:30 on Tuesday?
18
                MR. SCRUGGS: If the court could do it earlier
19
     just in case the testimony takes longer?
20
                THE COURT: Well, I have a luncheon that day at
2.1
     11:30 --
2.2
                MR. SCRUGGS: All right. 1:30 is fine.
23
                THE COURT: -- so 11:00 would not really give us
24
    much time. So 1:30 on Tuesday.
25
                MS. DAUGHREY:
                               I can't imagine, Your Honor, it's
```

going to take more than two or three hours at the very most.

THE COURT: Okay. And we'll all be prepared to stay late if we need to, Ms. Daughtrey?

MS. DAUGHREY: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. SCRUGGS: All right.

1.3

2.2

is going to -- Mr. Scruggs and perhaps Mr. Dehart's parents are going to make the initial requests to retrieve the Indiana material that's at the U.S. Attorney's Office in Indiana, try to get that back, and Ms. Daughtrey is going to give her blessing to that since apparently there's not going to be any prosecution in Indiana, so she will assist with that.

There is going to be a conference call, hopefully, between the parties including Detective Kniss and the defense expert with FBI Agent Hill, who apparently ran the mirror images, so that everybody can figure out exactly what he did and when.

Ms. Daughtrey is going to contact the Department of Justice lawyers involved in the national security matter and try to figure out how to get access to whatever statements the defendant made to those agents and whatever was seized from the defendant in Canada or Maine.

So hopefully you all can make -- and Detective Kniss is going to either prepare or be prepared to testify to a

```
chronology of exactly what he got when and what he did when,
 1
 2
     so forth. That would be, I think, very helpful to people.
           And can I hold onto these three documents that you
 3
 4
     have given me?
 5
                MR. SCRUGGS: Yes. Absolutely.
 6
                THE COURT: You have given me four documents.
 7
     I'll hold on to those.
 8
                THE CLERK: Are you going to make those exhibits?
 9
                THE COURT: I'm not going to make those exhibits
10
     right now. We may make them exhibits at the next hearing.
11
                THE CLERK:
                            Okay.
                THE COURT: And I will just encourage everyone,
12
13
     we make a whole lot more progress when we talk to each other
14
     and I think that's very needed in this case. And I hope
15
     that we can make some headway with that approach, and we
16
     will reassemble on Tuesday at 1:30.
17
           Okay. Good. We're in recess.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 1 2 3 I, BEVERLY E. "BECKY" COLE, Official Court 4 Reporter for the United States District Court for the Middle 5 District of Tennessee, with offices at Nashville, do hereby 6 certify: 7 That I reported on the stenotype shorthand machine 8 the proceedings held in open court on April 12, 2012, in the 9 matter of UNITED STATES OF AMERICA vs. MATTHEW PAUL DEHART, 10 Case No. 3:10-00250; 11 That a transcript of proceedings in connection 12 with the hearing was reduced to typewritten form by me; 13 That the foregoing transcript is a true and 14 accurate record of the proceedings to the best of my skills 15 and abilities; 16 This the 1st of July, 2014. 17 18 19 20 /s/ BEVERLY E. COLE, RPR 21 2.2 23 24 25